09/2[illegible]08

WEST

Help | Logout | Interrupt

Main Menu | Search Form | Posting Counts | Show S Numbers | Edit S Numbers | Preferences

Search Results -

Terms	Documents
l1 and project$1	45

Database: US Patents Full-Text Database; US Pre-Grant Publication Full-Text Database; JPO Abstracts Database; EPO Abstracts Database; Derwent World Patents Index; IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletins

Refine Search: `l1 and project$1` Clear

Search History

Today's Date: 1/10/2002

DB Name	Query	Hit Count	Set Name
USPT,PGPB,JPAB,EPAB,DWPI,TDBD	l1 and project$1 (Kwic all)	45	L4
USPT,PGPB,JPAB,EPAB,DWPI,TDBD	l1 and l2	0	L3
USPT,PGPB,JPAB,EPAB,DWPI,TDBD	project$1 adj4 manag$	919	L2
USPT,PGPB,JPAB,EPAB,DWPI,TDBD	(right$1 or permission$1 or authoriz$) adj7 (use$1 or usage$1 or borrow$) adj8 (resource$1 or tool$1)	305	L1

09/225,208

1/10/02

```
?show files
File  13:BAMP 2002/Dec W5
         (c) 2002 Resp. DB Svcs.
File  15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2002/Jan 07
         (c) 2002 ProQuest Info&Learning
File  22:Employee Benefits 1986-2001/Jan
         (c) 2001 Int.Fdn.of Empl.Ben.Plans
File  49:PAIS INT. 1976-2001/Nov
         (c) 2002 Public Affairs Information Service
File  75:TGG Management Contents(R) 86-2002/Dec W5
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File 122:Harvard Business Review 1971-2001/Dec
         (c) 2002 Harvard Business Review
File 150:Gale Group Legal Res Index(TM) 1980-2002/Jan 08
         (c)2002 The Gale Group
File 473:FINANCIAL TIMES ABSTRACTS 1998-2001/APR 02
         (c) 2001 THE NEW YORK TIMES
File 475:Wall Street Journal Abs 1973-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 The New York Times
File 476:Financial Times Fulltext 1982-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 Financial Times Ltd
File 623:Business Week 1985-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc
File   9:Business & Industry(R) Jul/1994-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 Resp. DB Svcs.
File  16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File  18:Gale Group F&S Index(R) 1988-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File  20:Dialog Global Reporter 1997-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 The Dialog Corp.
File  54:FOODLINE(R): Market Data 1979-2002/Jan 07
         (c) 2002 LFRA
File  93:TableBase(R) Sep 1997-2002/Dec W5
         (c) 2002 Resp. DB Svcs.
File 112:UBM Industry News 1998-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 United Business Media
File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2002/Jan 08
         (c)2002 The Gale Group
File 160:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1972-1989
         (c) 1999 The Gale Group
File 192:Industry Trends & Anal. 1997/Jun
         (c) 1997 Decision Resources Inc.
File 359:Chemical Economics Handbook 2000/Jul
         (c) 2000 SRI International
File 360:Specialty Chemicals Update Program 2000/Q2
         (c) 2000 SRI International
File 481:DELPHES Eur Bus 95-2002/Dec W3
         (c) 2002 ACFCI & Chambre CommInd Paris
File 484:Periodical Abs Plustext 1986-2001/Dec W5
         (c) 2002 ProQuest
File 545:Investext(R) 1982-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 Thomson Financial Networks
File 553:Wilson Bus. Abs. FullText 1982-2001/Nov
         (c) 2001 The HW Wilson Co
File 563:Key Note Market Res. 1986-2001/Aug 03
         (c) 2001 ICC Online Info. Group
File 569:Decision Res Pharm Ind Rpts 1998/Aug 03
          (c) 2000 Decision Res, Inc
File 570:Gale Group MARS(R) 1984-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File 583:Gale Group Globalbase(TM) 1986-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File 589:FI Defense Market Intelligence 2002/Jan 02
         (c) 2002 Forecast Intl/DMS
File 608:KR/T Bus.News. 1992-2002/Jan 09
         (c)2002 Knight Ridder/Tribune Bus News
```

```
File 621:Gale Group New Prod.Annou.(R) 1985-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Gale Group
File 624:McGraw-Hill Publications 1985-2002/Jan 09
         (c) 2002 McGraw-Hill Co. Inc
File 635:Business Dateline(R) 1985-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 ProQuest Info&Learning
File 696:DIALOG Telecom. Newsletters 1995-2002/Jan 08
         (c) 2002 The Dialog Corp.
File 745:Investext(R) PDF Index 1999--2002/Jan W1
         (c)2002 Thomson Fin. Networks
?ds

Set     Items   Description
S1     427168   (PROJECT? ? OR JOB? ? OR WORK? OR ACTIVIT$ OR ASSIGNMENT? -
              OR TASK? ?) (8N) (WORKER? OR EMPLOYEE? ? OR LABORER? ?) (8N) -
              (GROUP? OR DIFFERENT OR TEAM? OR MEMBER? ?)
S2      59168   (MANAG? OR SUPERVIS? OR KEEP? OR MONITOR?) (9N) (SHARING OR
              SHARE? ? OR DIFFERENT) (9N) (RESOURCE? ? OR TOOL OR TOOLS OR
              INSTRUMENT? ? OR VEHICLE? ?)
S3       3377   S1 AND S2
S4      49103   (PERMIT? OR PERMISSION? ? OR AUTHORI? OR ALLOW? OR APPROV?)
              (7N) (USAGE? OR USE OR USES) (8N) (TOOL OR TOOLS OR RESOURCE?
              ? OR INSTRUMENT? ? OR VEHICLE? ?)
S5         67   S3 AND S4
S6         41   RD (unique items)
S7         21   S6 AND PY <=1996 (Reviewed all)
?
```

WEST

Generate Collection

L4: Entry 44 of 45 File: TDBD Dec 1, 1991

TDB-ACC-NO: NB9112114

DISCLOSURE TITLE: Extensible Access Control List Mechanism.

PUBLICATION-DATA:
IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, December 1991, US

VOLUME NUMBER: 34
ISSUE NUMBER: 7B
PAGE NUMBER: 114 - 117

PUBLICATION-DATE: December 1, 1991 (19911201)

CROSS REFERENCE: 0018-8689-34-7B-114

DISCLOSURE TEXT:

- Disclosed is a design for Access Control Lists which allows for full extensibility in terms of the access control criteria and great generality in terms of expressing these criteria. This design allows for full user compatibility with the existing Discretionary Access Control (DAC) mechanism on the system. - Access Control Lists (ACLs) are used to implement DAC policies. DAC policies (also termed informal need-to-know policies) allow an authorized user to grant or deny access to some system resource based upon specified criteria. In many computer systems, these criteria are limited to some form of user or group identifier. The mechanism disclosed permits ready extensibility to other forms of identifiers. - A key requirement in the addition of ACLs to a UNIX* system is compatibility with the existing DAC mechanism - permission bits. The standard permission bits allow a user to define separate access permissions for the owner of the file, an associated group and for all other users. These access permissions may separately grant or deny read, write and execute access for the information object and are processed using a ternary algorithm: - if the effective user ID of a process matches the user ID of the owner of the object, then the process receives the access permissions defined for the owner. - - else if the effective group ID or one of the concurrent groups of the process matches the group ID of the object, then the process receives the access permissions defined for that group. - - otherwise the process receives the access permissions de fined for all other users. - A typical Access Control List for a UNIX system consists of an ordered list of entries. Each entry is tagged as being a user or group entry, and the user entries precede the group entries. The final entry in the list is the default entry. To determine access rights for a process, the ACL is searched for until an entry matches, and then the process receives the access rights associated with that entry. If no entry matches, then the process receives the default access rights. - There are two problems associated with this form of ACL. First, because it uses an ordered, first match algorithm, only one entry may apply to each process. While this is not a problem with ACLs which contain only user or group identifiers (which order naturally), adding other types of identifiers (time, location, project) makes such an Access Control List scheme confusing to users. If a user wishes to grant read and write access to a project and read access to a group, a user who is in both the project and the group may not receive the write access, depending on how the entries in the ACL are ordered by the user. - The second problem with this form of ACL is that each entry may contain only one type of identifier. This makes it impossible to express certain useful access control policies. For instance, a user may want to restrict access to a file to a user at the system console between 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, because the system console is supervised during these times and is restricted to authorized users. - Despite these limitations, Access Control Lists in UNIX are structured this way primarily to enable compatibility with the standard permission

bits. An ACL with a single user entry for the object owner, a single group entry for the object group and the default entry is equivalent to the permission bits. - The ACL mechanism described here addresses both of the limitations described above and achieves compatibility with the standard permission bits as well. This form of ACL consists of an unordered set of Access Control Entries with a separate default entry. Each Access Control Entry consists of: - a set of access modes (read, write or execute) - a tag indicating whether or not the entry is permissive, restrictive or both (termed specific) - a set of typed identifers When a process wishes to access an object, each entry in the object's ACL is examined. If all identifiers in the entry match the corresponding identifiers for the process, then the process receives the specified access mode permissions or restrictions. For instance, assume that a file has the following ACL: Modes Tag Typed Identifiers read,write permissive terminal:/dev/console; read permissive user:joe, group:system; read permissive user:sally, group:wheel; read,write restrictive group:students read,write restrictive time:1700-900; none others; This file could be read and written by anybody (except students) on the system console and could be read by user joe in the system group or by user sally in the wheel group. Nobody would be allowed to read or write the file between 5:00 P.M. and 9:00 A.M., nor could anybody in the group students access this file. Note that if either joe or sally is also in the group students, then they could not access the file either, because restrictions are preferred over permissions. That is, if one entry grants an access mode and an other entry denies it and both entries apply to the given process, then that mode of access will be denied. - This form of ACL solves both problems outlined above. For the first problem (and example), an ACL of the following sort could be used: Modes Tag Typed Identifiers read,write permissive project:Alamo; read permissive group:adm; none others; With this ACL, a user in both the project Alamo and the group adm would receive both read and write access. Note that if it is intended that a user in both the project and the group receive only read access, then the following ACL should be used: Modes Tag Typed Identifiers read,write permissive project:Alamo; read permissive group:adm; write restrictive project:Alamo, group:adm; none others; For the second problem, consider the case where a user wants to grant read access rights to users who are in two specific groups and to grant these users write access when they are logged in at a specific terminal. For this case the following ACL could be used: Modes Tag Typed Identifiers write permissive group:adm, group:system; terminal:/dev/tty4; read permissive group:adm;group:system; none others; In addition to the generality of this mechanism, compatibility is also achieved. Consider the following ACL on a file owned by user Danna with an associated group of Aggies: Modes Tag Typed Identifiers read specific user:Danna; read,write permissive group:Aggies; read,write,exec others; The key characteristic of the permission bits is that they are processed in a ternary fashion: that is, each specified class receives only the access permissions for that class. This is also the case for the above ACL. Danna will receive only read access. Even if she is also an Aggie, the specific tag on the user entry means that both permissions and restrictions apply, so that the first entry grants read permission and denies write and execute permissions. Users in the group Aggies (except for Danna) will receive only read and write access, because the others entry is not used if any other entry in the ACL was used. And other users, of course, receive read, write and execute permission. - It is probably worth noting the theoretical basis for the generality of the Access Control List mechanism described here. In propositional logic, every valid sentence can be expressed as a sum of products, where a product is a conjunction of terms and a sum is a disjunction of terms. This ACL mechanism is effectively a sum of products. Each Access Control Entry is treated as a conjunctive term. The identifiers are equivalent to the conjuncts, and the ACE is valid if, and only if, all identifiers match equivalent identifiers for the requesting process, just as a conjunction is true if, and only if, each conjunct is true. The Access Control List itself is treated as a disjunction, since all ACEs are in effect ORed together, since permission is granted only if at least one ACE grants permission. * Trademark of UNIX System Laboratories, Inc.

SECURITY: Use, copying and distribution of this data is subject to the restictions in the Agreement For IBM TDB Database and Related Computer Databases. Unpublished - all rights reserved under the Copyright Laws of the United States. Contains confidential commercial information of IBM exempt from FOIA disclosure per 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and protected under the Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT: The text of this article is Copyrighted (c) IBM Corporation 1991. All rights reserved.

07867165/9
DIALOG(R)File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB
(c)2003 The Gale Group. All rts. reserv.

07867165 SUPPLIER NUMBER: 16867125 (THIS IS THE FULL TEXT)
ManagePro 3.0 projject manager takes the work out of teamwork. (Avantos Performance Systems' project management package) (includes related article on test methods) (Software Review)(Evaluation)

Rapoza, Joe
PC Week, v12, n19, p74(2)
May 15, 1995
DOCUMENT TYPE: Evaluation ISSN: 0740-1604 LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
RECORD TYPE: FULLTEXT; ABSTRACT
WORD COUNT: 1327 LINE COUNT: 00125

ABSTRACT: Avantos Performance Systems' $279 to $1,600 ManagePro 3.0 project management software provides superior workgroup features and useful planning aids. However, ManagePro's people-oriented approach may not supply sufficient tools for handling complicated business projects. The innovative features included are best applied to personnel management and motivational needs. Goals and tasks can be assigned to each employee in the project files and various innovative methods of entering data have been included in the new software design. Unique to ManagePro are features to be used in encouraging employees involved in the project through recognition, performance reviews and consistent feedback. Tasks can easily be reassigned through the handy drag-and-drop features incorporated into the friendly interface.

TEXT:

Avantos people-oriented package widens network appeal with information-sharing feature.

The latest upgrade of Avantos Performance Systems Inc.'s ManagePro, a project-management application with a flair for personnel management, includes several new features that should make the product more attractive to managers who like a people-oriented approach to getting things done on time.

One major improvement in ManagePro 3.0 for Windows is a MultiLink networking feature that lets managers share information about projects and coordinate employees and other resources assigned to those projects. Other additions include the ability to incorporate budget and cost information in projects, improved reporting features, and enhancements to the program's calendar view.

PC Week Labs found ManagePro's emphasis on managing projects by managing the people who do the work to be innovative and effective. But even though ManagePro's people-management features are valuable, businesses planning complex projects may be better off with a full- fledged project-management package, such as SuperProject from Computer Associates International Inc. or Primavera Project Planner from Primavera Systems Inc.

Avantos released ManagePro 3.0 for Windows in March; a single- user license is $279, an upgrade is $99, and a 10-user license is $1,600. The software runs on any PC with at least a 386 CPU and 4M bytes of RAM.

Management tools

Planning a project in ManagePro was intuitive. In the Top Level Goal Planner window, we created a goal of testing a dozen new notebook computers by April 24. We made a hierarchical list of tasks needed to achieve this goal; specific tasks, such as shock tests, were listed under more general ones, such as durability tests.

Double-clicking on each task opened a detailed form. Here we could enter a title and a description of the task, assign workers to it, set start and due dates, and assign a priority to accomplishing that task. Notes and documents could be attached to any goal or task.

ManagePro lets managers assign goals and tasks to employees from virtually any window. For example, when adding a member to the notebook-testing team in the People/Team Planner window, we could specify that one of this employee's tasks would be testing notebook performance. This was quicker than closing that employee's window, going to the window for adding

tasks, and adding the employee there.

Another shortcut is the Quick Input menu, which quickly brought up forms for adding goals, to-do items, and other events, so we could enter these as the need occurred.

The improved Global Calendar window can display the year, month, week, or day, and can show events, to-do items, goals, commitments, and personnel assignments. The calendar's interface resembles that of a personal information manager; we could click on the day and time that we wanted to schedule an activity, such as an employee's annual review, then enter the pertinent information.

For a quick look at how schedules for achieving goals and completing tasks overlapped, we could check out the Gantt chart in the Timeline view.

A seemingly simple but very powerful addition to this version of ManagePro is the ability to add fields for budgeted and actual costs when planning projects. This allows managers to track total costs and detect overruns, and is the sort of feature common in more conventional project-management packages. Some other features usually found in project-management packages, such as tools for developing complex processes and the ability to track workers' hours, are absent from ManagePro.

On the other hand, ManagePro's features for motivating employees as well as monitoring them are seldom found in traditional project- management packages. These techniques include providing regular feedback, recognition, and reviews, all of which can be scheduled through ManagePro's People/Team Planner window. By listing certain employees in the People Status Board, managers can also be reminded of when such actions should be taken (see screens, left).

For those who need help managing not only people but also projects, pressing the button for management advice (which has a light-bulb icon) on ManagePro's main tool bar provides tips on topics from coaching employees to coordinating several projects.

ManagePro's reporting features proved very powerful and customizable. The application comes with more than 30 report templates based on the Goals, People, and Actions views. Virtually every view and window also have sort and filter buttons, which let us create reports based on the window being viewed.

Ease of use

The user interface in ManagePro is well-organized and easy to use. The tool bar at the top of the main window is split into four sections: Goals, People, Action, and a section with buttons to call up the ManagePro Assistant window, to generate reports, and to get management advice.

The ManagePro Assistant window, which can be set to open whenever the program starts, allowed us to look quickly at the current day's tasks and goals and to see who had been assigned to work on them.

Items could be dragged and dropped in every window. For instance, we could give an employee a task just by dropping the task on that employee's name.

From the Preferences submenu, we were able to configure virtually every aspect of the application, from how the tool bars are set up to whether the workweek should be Monday through Friday or Tuesday through Saturday. A configuration tool made it easy to customize every window.

ManagePro even allowed us to choose whether to use the program just to manage people, just to manage goals, or for variations on these options. PC Week Labs tested the most comprehensive network option, which integrates people and goal management.

Workgroup capabilities

ManagePro databases can be shared on a network in several ways. We initially created a network directory for shared databases and created a ManagePro database with one password, which gave full access rights to anyone who had access to the network drive. This setup makes it easy for workgroup members to share information and updates the database in real time, but it is not a good option if sensitive personnel information is kept in the database.

To test a more restricted option, we created another network database, set our own password for full access, and then gave selected workers access to portions of the database.

We did this by assigning them different passwords that corresponded with their limited access rights.

With ManagePro's MultiLink feature, we also linked portions of several

ManagePro databases. While most managers will probably maintain private ManagePro databases, with MultiLink they can share relevant information across the network.

MultiLink could prove useful if, for instance, a financial manager needed to spot projects where funds were running low. Other managers could use MultiLink to grant the financial manager access just to the budget and cost figures in their databases.

ManagePro supports Microsoft Corp.'s Mail, Novell Inc.'s WordPerfect Office, and Lotus Development Corp.'s cc:Mail and Notes mail systems. We used Microsoft Mail to send reminders and recognition notices to team members.

Ease of installation and learning

ManagePro's installation and upgrade processes were solid. When upgrading from a previous version of ManagePro, selecting the converter program in the install routine was all it took to turn old ManagePro databases into ManagePro 3.0 databases.

The on-line help was top-notch, and ManagePro also comes with four tutorials. Each was interactive and informative; none included unnecessary multimedia eye candy.

Related article: Test Methodology

PC Week Labs installed Avantos Performance Systems Inc.'s ManagePro 3.0 for Windows on a 33MHz 486-based Gateway 2000 Inc. 486/33C system with 16M bytes of RAM. We tested the software under Microsoft Corp.'s Windows for Workgroups 3.11 and Novell Inc.'s NetWare 3.12.

COPYRIGHT Ziff-Davis Publishing Company 1995

SPECIAL FEATURES: illustration; table
COMPANY NAMES: Avantos Performance Systems Inc.--Products
INDUSTRY CODES/NAMES: CMPT Computers and Office Automation
DESCRIPTORS: Project management--Computer programs
PRODUCT/INDUSTRY NAMES: 7372490 (Applications Software Pkgs NEC (Micro)); 7372410 (Business Software Pkgs (Micro))
SIC CODES: 7372 Prepackaged software
TRADE NAMES: ManagePro 3.0 (Human resources management software)--Evaluation
OPERATING PLATFORM: Microsoft Windows
FILE SEGMENT: CD File 275
?